

## CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

## Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, May 12, 1989

- Present: C. Bertrand, Chair; B. Spanos; E. Gardham; C. Foster; J. Appleby; R. Pallen; D. Dicks; S. Ruby; G. Valaskakis; M. Szabo; J. Gavin; P. Widden; E. Preston; W. Gilsdorf; R. Schmid; G. Auchinachie; R. Kilgour; C. Levy; G. Decarie; R. Perigoe; I. Irvine; C. Gray; S. Dubas; C. White; M. Oppenheim; J. Drysdale; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; J. Ryan; M. Brian; G. Trudel; H. Shulman; C. Davis; M. Mendell; G. Szamosi; R. Seppanen; E. Budik. S. O'Hara; M. Sullivan; S. Maguire; S. Letovsky; H. McLachlan; F. Fazio; B. Leonhardt; B. Jenkins; J. Bara.
- Regrets: M. Barlow; H. deRomer; M. Giguere; Y.-L. Khoury; E. Mourillon; M. Moser; J. Brown; J. Grundy; R. Gossen.
- Absent: D. Acland; H. McQueen; Z. Hamlet; C. Barton; D. Salee; B. Barkman; M. Dionne; N. deGraff.

Documents considered and distributed at the meeting

- |                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| ASFC 89-4M-A     | Elections/ratifications for Arts and Science Faculty Committees      |
| ASFC 89-4M-B     | "Excellence in Teaching Award"                                       |
| ASFC 89-4M-C/62U | Honours Programmes in Arts and Science                               |
| ASFC 89-4M-C/63U | Undergraduate Curriculum Change Proposals                            |
| ASFC 89-4M-D     | Departmental Designation - Department of Journalism                  |
| ASFC 89-4M-E     | FCAR Center of Excellence - Centre de Calcul Mathématique Algébrique |
| ASFC 89-4M-F     | Academic Standards for Prerequisites - the C-Rule                    |
| ASFC 89-4M-G     | Re-Admission of "super-failed" students                              |

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1340.

2. Approval of Agenda

- 89-4-1 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Fazio) that the Agenda be approved.

Vice-Dean Dicks requested to add curriculum issues under Item 14, if time would allow Council to deal with them.

The Dean agreed.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Minutes of April 6, 1989

89-4-2

It was moved and seconded (O'Hara/Schmid) that the minutes of April 6, 1989, be approved.

CARRIED

4. Remarks from the Chair

The Dean stated that Mme. B. Gaudet had informed the Office of the Dean that CREPUQ would be drafting a document on behalf of Quebec Universities concerning the Copyright Compliance legislation. It was hoped that CREPUQ's document and lobbying efforts would have some effect on the second stage of the legislative process. The minutes of the ASFC discussions would be used by Mme. Gaudet and Maître Racicot to represent some of the issues raised at Council. Council's views would reach Ottawa and it remained to be seen whether they would have any impact on the legislative process.

The Dean advised Council that a document from Ken Whittingham had been distributed regarding the nomination process for Honorary Degree candidates for the 1990 June and November convocation ceremonies.

The Dean informed Council that the resolution passed at the April 6 meeting regarding the \$ 100 fine for the late submission of Work Term Reports in the Institute for Co-Operative Education had been forwarded to Senate. The Senate Steering Committee considered the motion and replied as follows:

"Concerning the above, this is to advise that the Steering Committee, at its meeting of 25 April 1989, considered the resolution which was adopted by the Arts and Science Faculty Council on 6 April 1989 and...

...the feeling was expressed that Senate itself did not have the authority to rescind the imposition of fees; that while Senate could recommend to the Office of the Rector that a particular fee be rescinded, it would be illogical to do so with respect to a fee that has never been approved by the Office of the Rector, nor put into effect; and that the issue of the imposition of such fees in general should not be submitted to Senate for full debate in the absence of due preparation, study and consideration of the basis for such discussion.

In consequence, the Steering Committee has asked me to advise that it considers the question of the \$ 100.00 fine for late submission of work-term reports to have been dealt with; and that if there is need for a Senate discussion on the general issue of the imposition of such fees, consideration should be given to the preparation of a discussion document at the level of the Faculty of Arts and Science."

The Dean stated that he would ask the ASFC Steering Committee to consider whether further discussion was necessary. In the meantime the \$ 100 fine for the late submission of work term reports in Co-Op did not exist.

5. Questions and Announcements

None

6. Elections/ratifications for Arts and Science Faculty Committees

CUSA's representatives advised Council that they did not wish to submit names for ratification at this meeting. Names would be submitted in September, 1989.

Peter Regimbald volunteered to act as scrutineer. The election results were as follows:

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTERS

Dr. R. Bernard (EDUC)  
Dr. P. Shizgal (PSYC)  
Dr. J. Dowling (EXCI)  
Dr. R. Hall (MATH)

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Dr. W. Gilsdorf (COMS)  
Dr. L. Gauvin (EXCI)  
Dr. R. Schade (HIST)  
V. Hollinger (ENGL - part-time)

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY PANEL

(Academic Regulations Regarding Cheating)

Dr. C. Cupples (BIOL)  
Dr. B. Woodside (PSYC)  
Dr. B. Petrie (SOCI)

ELECTED

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Dr. P. Widden (BIOL)  
Dr. F. Krantz (HIST)  
Dr. S. Pyenson (SCHA)

ELECTED

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE ELECTIONS

Dr. R. T. Cronin, s.j. (BIOL)  
 Dr. V. McNamara (PHIL)  
 Dr. K. Kusano (SOCL)

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY APPEAL COMMITTEE  
(Regulations regarding Academic Re-evaluation)

Dr. V. Zeman (PHIL) - regular  
 Dr. M. Vipond (HIST) - regular  
 Dr. S. Hoffman (ENGL) - alternate

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY HONOURS COMMITTEE

Dr. M. Bross (PSYC)

ELECTED

ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY STUDENT REQUEST COMMITTEE

Dr. R. T. Cronin, s.j. (BIOL)  
 Dr. R.D. Kilgour (EXCI)

ELECTED

UNIVERSITY SENATE

89-4-3

It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Davis) that Dr. F. Bird (RELI) be added to the list of nominees.

CARRIED

Dr. A. Doyle (PSYC)  
 Dr. M. Stelcner (ECON)  
 R. Seppanen (ENGL - part-time)  
 Dr. W. Knitter (EDUC)

ELECTED

ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Dr. T. Arbuckle-Maag (PSYC)

ELECTED

ACADEMIC SERVICES COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Dr. J. Herz (ENGL)

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATIONCOMPUTER RESOURCES COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Vice-Dean Dicks pointed out that the Arts and Science Faculty Advisory Committee on Computers was to nominate 1 full-time faculty member for ratification by Council.

89-4M-4

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Gilsdorf) that the ratification of a member to the Computer Resources Committee of Senate be tabled until the Fall term of 1989.

CARRIEDUNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Dr. H. Ladd (PSYC)

ELECTEDSUB-COMMITTEE OF SENATE ON THE UNIVERSITY WRITING TEST

Dr. L. Sugden (FRAN)  
 Dr. A. Sharma (TESL)  
 Mr. H. Hill (ENGL)  
 Dr. P. Abrami (EDUC)

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATIONBOARD OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Dr. S. Misra (PHYS)  
 Dr. J. Barakett (EDUC)  
 Dr. B. Frank (PHYS)

ELECTEDGRADUATE AWARDS COMMITTEE

Dr. N. Metallinos (COMS)  
 Dr. M. Komoda (PSYC)

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION

7. "Excellence in Teaching Award"

89-4-5

It was moved and seconded (McLachlan/Fazio) that:

WHEREAS students would like to acknowledge excellent teaching, and

WHEREAS this year, CUSA (Concordia University Students' Association) has established an Excellence in Teaching Award, for which at most four winners (one for each faculty) will be selected, and

WHEREAS unlike other teaching awards at Concordia, recipients of this teaching award are nominated and selected only by the students, the beneficiaries of good teaching,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Arts and Science Faculty Council endorse CUSA's "Excellence in Teaching" Award, which will be in the form of a plaque, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Arts and Science Faculty Council endorse its presentation to the recipient from the Arts and Science Faculty during the Arts and Science Convocation Ceremony held at the end of every academic year in June.

McLachlan explained the selection process. Nominations are made by students; the nomination must be accompanied by ten additional student signatures and a text explaining why the faculty member should receive the award. The final decision is made by an evaluation committee. Fazio added that CUSA would consider course evaluations only in the case of a tie.

Vice-Dean Valaskakis suggested that in order to present this award at convocation it would have to be approved by Senate then by the Board. Carol Foster agreed.

The Dean explained that McLachlan and O'Hara were aware that this was the first step of the process. If the award is to be presented at convocation it should be endorsed by Council first.

Gray suggested that the title of the award include CUSA so that the award would be called "CUSA's Excellence in Teaching" Award. He then asked for an explanation of the criteria.

McLachlan stated that the criteria were the following: organization of material; ability to communicate; delivery style; innovative teaching techniques; flexibility, openness to ideas, promotes class discussions; accessibility, approachability, commitment; concern for students; enthusiasm, ability to promote interest in subject; knowledgeability; professionalism; and overall performance.

Fazio added that if in a given year there were no candidates who met the stated criteria the award would not be awarded. Students wish to emphasize "excellence".

CARRIED (as amended)



8. Departmental Designation - Department of Journalism

89-4-6

It was moved and seconded (Perigoe/Fazio) that the Journalism Programme be recognized officially as the Department of Journalism.

In response to Irvine's question whether there would be resource implications for other departments, the Dean stated that this was merely a change in departmental designation, without resource implications.

Oppenheim asked if specific criteria for differentiating a department from a programme existed.

The Dean explained that criteria existed. Leisure Studies would probably submit a similar request next year. If a programme had proven itself over the years, and had grown, it was considered a good idea to create a department. The minimum number of tenured faculty members required for a department was three.

CARRIED (unanimously)

9. FCAR Centre of Excellence - Centre de Calcul Mathématique Algébrique

89-4-7

It was moved and seconded (Byers/Gilsdorf) that the Arts and Science Faculty approves the establishment of an FCAR Centre of Excellence called Centre de Calcul Mathématique Algébrique.

Byers explained that one of the exciting developments in mathematics and computer science was the interaction of the two disciplines. Concordia was fortunate to have some internationally prominent groups in this area of research and the FCAR designation indicated the level of work that was occurring. Faculty Council was being asked for its support to approve this Centre of Excellence, so that the request could be forwarded to Senate.

The Dean added that Senate had recently established a new procedure for the establishment of research centres within the University. He stated that the next step in the process would be to forward the request to the Senate Research Committee, and then to Senate and the Board.

Levy pointed out that the title of the Centre should be "Centre du Calcul..." not Centre de...

Pallen stated that there were different types of Centres. The one that was being proposed was a University Research Centre which must be approved by the Board of Governors so that it will receive the appropriate support from the University in terms of resources comparable to the Centres that exist in Psychology and Chemistry. These Centres also received support from government agencies, only when they were recognized by the University as established research centres.

The Dean added that it should be noted that this would be an inter-university centre.

White asked if there existed currently an FCAR Infrastructure grant for this Centre or if an application had been submitted to FCAR. He stated that Council could not approve the establishment of an FCAR Centre of Excellence until it was funded by FCAR.

The Dean agreed, and stated that this concerned the establishment of a Centre du Calcul Mathématique Algébrique. It was hoped that it would become an FCAR supported centre in the future.

Byers agreed to remove the FCAR designation from the motion. The Centre is an inter-University Centre, but Concordia would take a leadership role and the Centre would be established at Concordia both physically and scientifically.

Dean Szabo pointed out that it would become difficult in the future to attract Ph.D. students in the University unless these types of initiatives were supported and centres of excellence were created. Some institutions had been extremely imaginative in this respect.

Ryan asked if 'interuniversitaire' and the fact that the Centre would be housed at Concordia should be reflected in the title, i.e. 'Centre interuniversitaire du Calcul Mathématique Algébrique à Concordia.

Pallen stated that this was not necessary. When approved by the Board of Governors it would be considered a university research centre at Concordia.

CARRIED (unanimously)

10. Honours Programmes in Arts and Science - Report 62U

89-4-8

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Ryan) that:

1. Honours programmes in Arts and Science continue, with the indicated modifications, under the general guidelines established by the Special Task Force on Curriculum (Cohen Report, ASFC, 1981) and published in the Calendar (Sections 31.003 and 16.2.4):

- a) a clearly structured programme of at least 60 credits; a maximum of 60 credits within one discipline, except where a longer programme is required by external regulatory bodies (e.g. Psychology, Chemistry);
- b) in mandated courses, a performance standard of B (GPA of 3.0) as a minimum, with a minimum of C (2.0) in any course to enter and remain in the Honours Programme.
- c) in non-mandated courses, a standard of C (GPA of 2.0) to remain in the programme.

2. The official decisions on admission and rejection from Honours programmes be made by the Departmental Honours Committee, which will be responsible for advising the student, Records Office and the Faculty Honours Committee of its decisions. The Faculty Honours Committee will monitor the operation of Honours programmes, recommend changes in policy and regulations to Faculty Council, and hear appeals arising from decisions of the Departmental Honours Committee.



Vice-Dean Dicks explained that this item had been debated in Council last year. The Curriculum Committee had been asked to consider the matter and report to Council. Table 1 of Report 62U showed current Honours programmes, their structure, the number of credits required in the core, the number of credits required in the whole programme, whether a special project was involved, and finally the number of students in these programmes. Table 2, listed the proposals that the Curriculum Committee considered. The last page indicated the Calendar changes that would result from the approval of these motions. The first part of the motion entailed a slight change in the current regulations that governed Honours Programmes. These regulations resulted from the Cohen Report, which established guidelines for Honours Programmes. The proposed changes were underlined. By proposing that the programme be "clearly structured" the Faculty would not only expect a performance standard but also that the programme be structured. Paragraphs b) and c) indicated the GPA equivalents. The second part of the motion was more complicated, as it suggested that the operation of the Honours Committee be changed from a body that admitted and rejected students to that of a policy and appeals body. Currently appeals regarding Honours were heard by Council. The approval of the motion would result in giving more authority to departments in the selection and rejection of Honours students.

Pallen added that one of the reasons for which this item had been referred to the Curriculum Committee was that the Honours programmes were essentially in place for students who continue in Graduate Studies. Honours programmes should have a research component, and of the 21 departments listed in Table 1 only six had a research component. The research component should be included in the structure of the programme, and those programmes that did not have such a component should develop it.

Decarie pointed out that while he was in favour of departments having more authority in determining who stays in Honours programmes, these two motions were not changing anything. On one hand, the motion proposed that departments would have more authority; on the other hand Section b) of Motion 1 stated that students needed a certain minimum "...to enter and remain in the Honours programme" which eliminated the decision making authority of the departmental Honours Committee. Decarie suggested that either Motion 2 be stricken altogether or that "...and remain in..." in b) of Motion 1 be removed.

89-4-9

It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Auchinachie) that the words "...and remain in" be stricken from Motion 1, Section b).

White stated that the amendment should be defeated as a department could always establish higher performance standards, so that the minimum for remaining in a programme could be higher.

Vice-Dean Ruby stated that some areas would remain unclear as to whether something should be decided by the Departmental or the Faculty Honours Committee. The mandate of the current Faculty Honours Committee was not clear either.

Gray wondered whether the proposed Motion would eliminate the work of the Honours Committee and whether the GPA would serve as an entitlement for student entry or continuance in an Honours programme.

Dicks responded that while a student may have the entitlement to be in the Honours programme, a student must still apply.

Byers stated that by striking "...and remain in..." one would eliminate guidelines for students in Honours programmes within the Faculty. Departments should have some latitude in interpreting Honours guidelines, and Motion 2 still allowed the departmental Honours Committee a certain amount of authority.

Decarie stated that he did not wish Council to develop a more rigid structure and it seemed that this Motion was doing so. He would like to see departments have more latitude, and he did not believe that a D student would be allowed to get an Honours degree even if the minimum requirements were not published.

Auchinachie stated that he supported the amendment because the current mechanism of appealing to the Arts and Science Faculty Council was clumsy and rarely used.

Shulman also supported the amendment because he felt that when regulations exist they would be interpreted too rigidly.

Dicks suggested that if "...and remain in" was stricken, part c) of the Motion would not have any meaning.

Ryan stated that he was in favour of the amendment and that an appeal procedure at the Faculty Honours Committee level would take care of the exceptions.

Vote on the amendment to strike the words "...and remain in..." of Section b), Motion 1:

In favour	20
Opposed	8
Abstentions	4

Widden stated that mixing letter grades and GPAs was unwise. Only the letter grade should be used. Dicks agreed to remove the GPA equivalents.

89-4-10

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Irvine) that Motion 1 be amended by deleting paragraph c).

Decarie stated that the deletion of c) would be unwise because b) and c) had to be consistent. Section c) should read "...in non-mandated courses a standard of C to enter the Honours programme". Dubas pointed out that the Motion should state something about a standard to remain in the Honours programme.

Decarie agreed that standards to remain in an Honours programme should exist, but these standards should be decided at the departmental level. The important issue was to ensure that no student with a D average graduates with Honours.

Dicks stated that if "...and remain in..." is removed from both part b) and c) of Motion 1 there would be nothing in the regulation that would ensure an acceptable standard for remaining in the Honours programme.

Ryan suggested that this motion needed further expansion to clarify a standard for remaining in an Honours programme, but that this should be administered and interpreted at the departmental level.

- 89-4-11 It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/Shulman) that the motion be tabled for further study.

CARRIED

11. Undergraduate Curriculum Change Proposals

- 89-4-12 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Trudel) that Council accept the Curriculum Course Change Proposals as contained in Report 63U.

Trudel asked that the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 25 "...after the first day of term..." be amended to read "...after the first day of the 3rd month of the term...".

In relation to the BA Honours in English and Creative Writing, and the BSc Honours in Physics, Pallen stated that an Honours programme should have a research component. These two programmes did not seem to have a research component.

Dicks responded that, so far, Council had rejected changes in the current rules that govern Honours, and there was no structure that specified a research component. The interpretation of the term research must be broad enough to include what exists currently. In some cases there exists a special project or a special course which is interpreted as research in the broader sense.

Auchinachie pointed out that the Honours in English and Creative Writing involved a great deal of individual creation. The term must be broadly interpreted to include work that requires a student to create their own material. To ask students to write a scientific paper in a degree that essentially fosters creativity is to enforce a limited definition of research on academic work that does not apply to all disciplines.

In response to a question concerning the number of credits required in the 42 credit Major in Creative Writing, Ryan stated that the reason for the restriction of the Major to 36 credits was originally approved by Council because at least two courses external to the department could form part of the coherence of a programme, as they would relate directly to the material of the Major.

Leonhardt added that the Curriculum Committee handled each case individually and in the case of the 42 credit Major in Creative Writing it would have been impossible to adequately cover the different areas required within this Major if there were not 42 credits.

The Dean commented that probably most disciplines in the Faculty could argue in favour of a 42 or 54 credit Major. The question that would then arise would be the question of whether Council wished to reject, by implication, the Cohen Report or whether it wished that departments abide by the Report. Council could either approve these proposed changes, which by implication would remove two more departments from the restrictions of the Cohen Report, or return them to the Curriculum Committee for proper reworking.

Oppenheim stated that there were some general principles which were being ignored. The 36 credit rule was very important. If Council would decide not to abide by it then the decision should be made. The other principle dealt with the Honours programmes and whether they should have a project or research component. There are a few programmes that do not have such a component and Council should not approve such programmes, unless it was decided that they do not need a research component. Council must either accept or reject a set of general principles.

Pallen explained that he would not expect a scientific research component in English, but he would expect some research. If there is no research component in these programmes, these items should be tabled until Honours programmes have been defined more clearly.

89-4-13

It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Oppenheim) that the proposed BA Honours in English and Creative Writing and the BSc Honours in Physics be tabled.

#### DEFEATED

Dubas pointed out that there were three or four courses in the BSc Honours Physics programme that were advanced laboratory courses, where students were required to complete special projects, which he considered to be a research component in the undergraduate sense.

Auchinachie added that in fiction a student created either a chapter in a novel or a short story, which involved creating something new, which could be considered a research component.

Byers reminded Council that there was a difference in the nature of research in various disciplines. In Mathematics research at the undergraduate level was very difficult. He thought that the term "research" should be referred to very carefully when one applies it to the work of undergraduate students.

White commented that one of the characteristics of an Honours programme was the completion of an Honours thesis, or something similar. He found it surprising that some programmes award Honours without an Honours thesis and without knowing whether a student was capable of making a contribution to their discipline which is what is expected at the graduate level. White recommended strongly that Honours programmes should attempt to incorporate Honours theses in their programmes.

Oppenheim stated that Council should be considering principles, such as the 36 credit rule and the question of whether honours should have a research component/project/essay.

The Dean stated that it would be unparliamentary for Council to consider principles in reference to the document presented, since Council had never pronounced on that issue before. However, Council did have to consider the current regulation, and if Council felt that the violation of that regulation should not be allowed then it had the right not to approve some of the changes being proposed in the document. If Council accepted the proposed document, then the 36 credit rule would be implicitly ignored.



89-4-14

It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Drysdale) that those programmes that go beyond 36 credits for a BA Major be tabled.

White asked for assurance that this motion referred only to new programmes, not existing 42 credit programmes.

Shulman asked why the Curriculum Committee did not abide by the regulations.

Dicks stated that the Curriculum Committee had the right to bring exceptions to Council.

Auchinachie pointed out that the Major in Creative Writing had always been a 42 credit programme.

#### MOTION WITHDRAWN

In response to Maguire's question regarding what would happen to students currently registered in a Major, the Dean responded that students are governed by the Calendar under which they entered the University.

Maguire then questioned the Note in the Modern Languages proposal on page 15. Dicks replied that in some cases students can be excluded from introductory courses. In the case of Arabic and Portugese it will depend on individual interviews.

Maguire also questionned the change in the GPA requirement for courses required in the Co-op programme (page 25).

89-4-15

It was moved and seconded (Maguire/O'Hara) that the GPA requirement for courses in the Institute for Co-Operative Education be 2.3 instead of 2.5.

Trudel argued that as more and more programmes are coming into Co-op it is harder to place students in a work term if they have a low GPA. The Co-op only accepts students who are in Honours or Specializations and when students have Cs employers do not interview them. Employers have a greater number of students to choose from and the Co-op decided to increase the GPA to maintain a high standard. Students coming into the Co-op from CEGEPs have GPAs of 3.5, therefore it was felt that 2.5 was not unreasonable.

#### DEFEATED

#### Vote on Report 63U

In favour of adoption	26
Opposed	3
Abstentions	6

#### CARRIED



12. Re-Admission of "super-failed" students

89-4-16

It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Auchinachie) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends:

- a) that all applications by super-failed students for readmission to the University be submitted to appropriate departments for their recommendations.
- b) that no specific period of absence from study should be required for readmission, whether such period be defined formally or informally

Decarie stated that departments should be involved in the readmission of students, and that there should not be a rigid time period before students are eligible to apply for readmission. Such decisions should not be made in a purely bureaucratic fashion without consulting the departments. A specific period of absence from study should not be required for readmission.

Oppenheim agreed in general terms, but he expressed concern about not having any requirement for readmission to the University.

The Dean pointed out that the Registrar was responsible for readmitting super-failed students. The motion asked that the Registrar consult the departments concerned before making a decision to readmit or not.

Vice-Dean Ruby stated that she could not understand why Decarie would want to add this responsibility to the departments. She added that it was already difficult in cases of first time failures to get information from departments concerning the readmission of students.

Foster commented that the Registrar would welcome the departments' help in dealing with this difficult and time-consuming task.

CARRIED (unanimously)

13. The C-Rule

89-4-17

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Widden) that the following motion be forwarded to Senate:

THAT Senate approve the principle of applying a minimum standard of a C-Grade in prerequisite courses for the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Dicks explained that over the last three years a number of departments had made proposals that a "C-Rule" be added to the prerequisite structure for certain courses, including a set of proposals from Biology passed by Council three years ago. The idea of the "C-Rule" was to control the level of entry into courses with difficult material and to ensure that all students started at roughly the same point in more difficult courses so that they can all follow the material. Dicks stressed that the use of the word 'principle' should be noted as it implied that the Faculty could use the C-Rule either selectively or universally.

Ryan stated that he appreciated the intent of the motion as a responsible way to ensure not only prerequisites but also progression of competence in a discipline. However, he was concerned about the student who could meet the graduation requirements but possibly not meet the prerequisite standards.

Byers supported the motion. He stated that the C-Rule would be beneficial for Math students because Math courses follow a sequence and a student who goes from course to course with a D- gains nothing in the long run.

Maguire stated that the APC recommended that the Faculty of Arts and Science try the GPA rule for two years before introducing any additional C-rules.

The Dean explained that the C-rule would not necessarily have to be applied universally.

Shulman pointed out that if students got a D+ in a prerequisite course they would not be able to complete a Major in that discipline. He objected to the idea that a student who received a D+ would be prevented from continuing in a department. However, if the rule were flexible he would support it.

Preston asked if a student would be allowed to take a course over again.

The Dean responded that this was possible. It would mean that a student would have to complete 93 or 96 credits instead of 90 credits in a programme.

O'Hara rejected the motion as it penalized students, because some prerequisites have nothing in common with courses that follow.

Leonhardt pointed out that students require the signature of an Advisor before they can register. In order to get that signature they require the Advisor's approval. Advisors should help in ensuring that students have passed their prerequisites with appropriate grades to continue in the programme.

Vice-Dean Pallen pointed out that there are cases where students register simultaneously for two courses, one in the first term, which is a prerequisite for the course in the second term. If students fail the first course they theoretically should not be allowed to take the second. However, the issue of removing such students from courses (if the Registrar does not have a method for doing so) would have to be addressed.

In response to Leonhardt's comment, the Dean stated that an Advisor could not prevent a student from taking a course without the C-rule in place. At present an Advisor could not withhold a signature, because the student has every right to take a course regardless of the grade received in a prerequisite course, as long as the student passed.

Vote: In favour	19
Opposed	7
Abstentions	5

CARRIED

14. Other Business

Documents ASFC 89-4M-C/Addendum to Report 63U and ASFC 89-4M-C (General Studies in Arts and Science) were distributed for consideration at the next ASFC meeting.

15. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 23, 1989, at 9:30 a.m. in AD-131, Loyola Campus.

16. Adjournment

89-4-18 It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Szamosi) that the meeting be adjourned at 1628.

/eg